

DRAFT
Area-Wide Soil Contamination Project
Work Group II – Protective Measures
Work Group Charter

Background

Soil in large areas of Washington State is contaminated with low-to-moderate levels of contaminants, including arsenic and lead, caused by a range of historical activities. As Washington's population has grown, many of these areas have been developed into residential neighborhoods, schools, and parks. These development activities have created pressures for cleanup and raised a variety of health, environmental, and marketplace concerns. The Departments of Ecology, Health, and Agriculture and the Office of Community Development have chartered a task force to address issues of area-wide soil contamination in Washington State. The Area-Wide Soil Contamination Task Force will work with two work groups and a consultant team to develop recommendations for the chartering agencies by June 2003 on a statewide strategy to respond to area-wide soil contamination problems.

The project will study the nature and geographic extent of area-wide soil contamination in Washington, identify feasible measures to protect human health and the environment, and recommend institutional and/or regulatory changes to improve how area-wide soil contamination problems are addressed. During the course of the project, the Agencies and the consultant team will also develop and implement a public involvement plan to educate the public and provide opportunities for public participation in the project.

The Charge to the Work Group

The Work Group is being created to advise the four agencies on remedial measures for addressing area-wide soil contamination problems posed by arsenic and lead. Specifically, the Work Group is being asked to provide recommendations on the following questions:

- What are practical and effective measures that can be taken by individuals to reduce exposure prior to implementation of cleanup actions?
- What are technically feasible remedial measures for addressing widespread low-to-moderate soil contamination problems?
- What remedial measures (if any) should Ecology identify as "model remedies" under the Model Toxics Control Act?

Products

Work Group II will be supported by a contractor team selected for this project. The contractor team will produce a number of documents and other deliverables in support of and in collaboration with the Work Group. These documents are outlined in the attached Area-Wide Soil Contamination Project Scope of Work.

Assumptions

The Work Group will operate from the following assumptions:

- MTCA Model Remedy Provisions: The evaluation of remedial measures will be performed in accordance with the requirements in the Model Toxics Control Act Cleanup Regulation (Chapter 173-340 WAC). Key provisions include, but are not limited to, the following sections: (1) Model remedies (WAC 173-340-390); (2) Selection of cleanup actions (WAC 173-340-360); (3) Development of cleanup action alternatives that include remediation levels (WAC 173-340-355); and (4) Expectations for cleanup action alternatives (WAC 173-340-370).
- Cleanup Standards: The extent of the area-wide soil contamination problem in Washington is defined by the MTCA Cleanup Standards. Ecology has recently completed a five-year process to review and update those standards. Consequently, the Work Group is not being asked to review or provide recommendations on (1) cleanup standards for individual hazardous substances, (2) the risk policies underlying those standards, or (3) the technical methods used to establish the standards for arsenic and lead.
- Ground Water Protection: The project will focus on problems and solutions associated with low-to-moderate levels of widespread soil contamination. The project has been designed based on the assumption that ground water contamination problems are unlikely to be associated with the low-to-moderate concentrations of arsenic and lead.
- Relationship to Other Project Tasks and Task Force Deliberations: The reports and evaluations prepared by Work Group II will be provided to the Task Force for their consideration as they develop overall recommendations for the four agencies. As appropriate, the Work Group II report will be integrated into the Task Force report and recommendations. In order to ensure that Work Group II's activities are fully integrated into the overall project, and to provide opportunities for stakeholder views represented by Task Force members to influence the scope and direction of Work Group II's work, the Task Force will be asked to review and provide comments on Work Group II's scope of work and interim products. In addition, several of Work Group II's products are inputs to other tasks (e.g. cost analyses).
- Decision Making and Consensus: The overall goal is to develop Work Group products that represent the consensus of Work Group members. The desired consensus outcome is one in which all Work Group members support Work Group products. To the extent that full consensus is not reached, Work Group products will reflect the range of views across the Work Group.

- **Individual Protection Measures:** The original project scope of work included a task designed to evaluate the effectiveness of measures that individuals might take to reduce the potential for exposure to contaminated soils prior to implementation of cleanup actions. This task was not included in the final scope of work because of budget constraints and concerns that information needed perform this evaluation is not available. Work Group II will be asked to consider the results of the information survey to determine if such an evaluation can be performed.

Roles and Responsibilities

Work Group Members

Work Group members are responsible for participating in the identification, review, and analysis of options; coordinating input and ideas from organizations they represent; participating in Work Group discussions; and making recommendations for consideration by the four agencies and the Task Force.

Kris Hendrickson—Task Manager

In addition to participating as a member of the Work Group, the Task Manager is responsible for managing and directing the contractor technical staff preparing the various evaluations and reports. The Task Manager is responsible for organizing and facilitating the Work Group meetings.

Contractor Technical Team

Contractor technical team members are responsible for performing the evaluations and analyses assigned by the Task Manager. It is anticipated that some contractor technical team members will attend some (but not all) of the Work Group meetings.

Dave Bradley/Jim White—Agency Representatives

In addition to participating as members of the Work Group, the Agency Representatives are responsible for forming the Work Group, working with the Task Manager to identify evolving resource needs that might require contract modifications, and providing backup facilitation support.

Elizabeth McManus—Task Force and Work Group Coordination

Attend work group meetings as budget allows to facilitate coordination between work groups and the Task Force on development of information and deliverables. Conduct state surveys with questions developed by contractor technical staff.

Dawn Hooper—Agency Task Force and Work Group Coordination

Attend work group meetings as time allows to facilitate coordination between work groups and the Task Force on development of information and deliverables.

Schedule

It is anticipated that the Work Group will hold six meetings between January and December 2002 as follows.

- In *March* the Work Group will hold its initial meeting to review and finalize the Work Group Charter and identify key issues and concerns.

- In *May* the Work Group will meet to review and discuss the results of the information survey and the proposed site categories and range of alternatives to be evaluated in the model remedy analysis. The Work Group will also review available information on individual protection measures to determine whether to modify the project scope of work.
- In *June* the Work Group will meet to review and discuss the cost analysis issue paper and the human health and environmental assessment issue paper.
- In *August* the Work Group will meet to review and discuss the permanent solutions issue paper.
- In *October* the Work Group will meet to review and discuss the draft model remedy report and recommendations. This meeting will focus on identifying areas of agreement, areas of disagreement, and areas requiring further clarification and/or evaluation.
- In *November* the Work Group will meet to review and discuss the revised model remedy report and recommendations.